RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION					
2				28)	4 SEP 24 AM 10: 43	
3	In the	Matter of)		, 62. 2. 10.10 10	
4)		CELA	
5 6		a for Congress and Beverly Massa, in her cial capacity as treasurer)	MUR 6275	CLLM	
7		Massa	Ś			
8	Josep	h Racalto	j j			
9	-		ŕ			
10					•	
11	SECOND GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT					
12	I.	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED				
13		(1) Take no further action as to Massa for	Congress	and Beverly Massa in I	ner official	
14	capacity as treasurer, concerning the alleged violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b)					
15		(formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)).1	•	•	. ,	
16						
17		(2) Dismiss the allegation that Massa for (
18		capacity as treasurer, or Eric Massa vi	olated 52	U.S.C. § 30114(b) (for	merly 2 U.S.C.	
19		§ 439a(b)).				
20						
21		(3) Dismiss the allegation that Joseph Rac	alto violat	ed 52 U.S.C. § 30114(l	o) (formerly	
22		2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)).				
23						
24		(4) Approve the attached factual and lega	ıl analyses	•		
25		(5) Approve the appropriate letters.				
26		(6) Close the file.				
27	II.	BACKGROUND				
28		This matter involves allegations that form	er Congre	ssman Eric Massa, his o	campaign	
29	committee, Massa for Congress (the "Committee"), and Joseph Racalto, Massa's Congressional					
30	Chief of Staff, violated the Act in connection with a \$40,000 payment from the Committee to					
31	Racal	Racalto on March 4, 2010, for a "campaign management fee." Because that payment may have				
32	relate	related to an unreported deferred compensation arrangement, the Commission found reason to				

On September 1, 2014, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, (the "Act") was transferred from Title 2 to new Title 52 of the United States Code.

- believe that the Committee violated 52 U.S.C. § 30104 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)) by failing to
- 2 report debts and obligations.² The Complaint also asserted that Racalto either may not have
- 3 performed sufficient work to justify the amount of the payment or had "obtained [the payment]
- 4 through deceit," in which case the Committee, Massa, or Racalto may have converted campaign
- funds to personal use in violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30114 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a).³ The
- 6 Commission took no action concerning that allegation pending the results of an investigation into
- 7 the "circumstances of the payment."⁴
- 8 The evidence obtained during the investigation indicates that Racalto conducted work on
- 9 behalf of the Committee related to campaign activities for which he was entitled to some
- 10 compensation, and the parties agree as to that much. Whether the value of that work to the
- 11 Committee reasonably supports the \$40,000 amount of the payment, however, is sharply

See Certification, MUR 6275 (Dec. 28, 2010); Factual & Legal Analysis, MUR 6275 (Massa for Congress) ("F&LA").

Compl. at 7. Regarding the payment to Racalto, allegations that Rep. Massa may have sexually harassed members of his staff, including Racalto, were the subject of a House Ethics Committee investigation but a final report on that investigation was never issued. See Statement of the Chairman and Ranking Member Regarding Former Representative Eric Massa (July 15, 2011), http://ethics.house.gov/press-release/statement-chairman-and-ranking-member-regarding-former-representative-eric-massa; House, Feds Open Massa Investigation, ASSOC. PRESS (Apr. 21, 2010), http://www.nbcnews.com/id/36692365/; Carol Leonnig, Massa Gave \$40,000 to Aide Before Resigning as Congressman, WASH. POST (Apr. 17, 2010), http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/16/AR2010041603982.html. On March 5, 2010, Rep. Massa formally resigned from Congress effective March 8, 2010. See Stephanie Condon, Rep. Eric Massa Resigns, Takes Responsibility for Harassment Charges, CBS News (Mar. 5, 2010), http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-6270838-503544.html.

See Certification ¶ 2; First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 7. The Complaint also alleged that a \$31,896.42 payment to GMAC on March 4, 2010, for the lease of a campaign vehicle the day after Rep. Massa announced his retirement may have violated the Act's personal use prohibition. Compl. at 5. The Commission was equally divided as to whether to find reason to believe the Committee and Eric Massa violated 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b) in connection with that payment. See Certification (Nov. 19, 2010).

The amount the Committee should pay to Racalto is currently the subject of a pending civil suit between the parties. See Massa for Congress v. Joseph Racalto, No. 11-1690CV (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Mar. 4, 2011) (complaint originally filed in Monroe County on Mar. 4, 2011, but venue changed to Steuben County on Nov. 28, 2011).

disputed and not readily ascertainable from the available evidence. The investigation determined

2 there was no written deferred compensation plan between Racalto and the Committee for his

3 campaign work. And whether an oral agreement existed is a point of conflict among the

Respondents, although the evidence reflects that the parties discussed at least the possibility of

compensation shortly before Racalto sought payment.

Thus, given the lack of substantial evidence that the Committee agreed to pay Racalto before March 2010, there is no basis to conclude that the Committee had incurred a debt that it may have been required to disclose before it received the demand for payment. Moreover, because it appears that Racalto performed much of the work that would have been the subject of the Committee's payment during the same reporting period in which he made his demand and the Committee issued that payment, no reportable debt would have been incurred as to that work. We therefore recommend that the Commission take no further action with regard to the Committee's alleged violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)).

As to the allegation that the Committee's \$40,000 payment to Racalto constituted impermissible personal use of campaign funds — either because it was excessive or obtained through false pretenses — the available evidence suggests that the payment compensated Racalto at least in part for work provided in connection with Rep. Massa's election campaign. Given the wide latitude vested in committees and candidates to retain services and compensate staff within commercially reasonable bounds and the difficulty of discerning on this record what would have constituted a reasonable amount of compensation, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the allegation that the Committee, Rep. Massa, or Racalto violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)), and close the file.

III. RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

In assessing the nature of the \$40,000 payment to Racalto, we sought evidence concerning the substance of Racalto's work for the Committee, whether an oral or written agreement existed regarding payment for that work, and the manner in which Racalto obtained authorization from officials for the Committee to issue the payment. We engaged in formal document discovery, including the review of a substantial volume of campaign documents, and interviewed numerous witnesses, including Racalto, Eric and Beverly Massa, the Committee's assistant treasurer, Vicki Winpisinger, who issued the payment to Racalto, and Neil Reiff, the Committee's former counsel.

A. The Extent and Value of Racalto's Campaign Work

The witnesses interviewed in this matter generally agree that Racalto provided some campaign-related services to the Committee. They disagree, however, about the amount and materiality of that work. The extensive documentary record we compiled relating to the services Racalto provided demonstrates that Racalto participated in some campaign activities between September 2009 through March 2010, but primarily in early 2010. That evidence, however, does not resolve whether the volume or substance of his services justified the \$40,000 amount of the payment he received supposedly as compensation for those efforts.

We interviewed Racalto in connection with the nature of the work he provided the Committee and his demand for payment in the amount of \$40,000. He stated that he began his work for Massa and the Committee in the Fall of 2008.⁶ He served the congressional office as

Report of Investigation of Joseph Racalto at 1 (Jun. 9, 2011) ("Racalto ROI"); see also Racalto Discovery Resp., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0533, 0551 to 0658 (Mar. 8, 2011) ("Racalto Docs.") (providing e-mails dated after the November 2008 General Election discussing staffing the new congressional office, office space, and salaries).

- 1 Chief of Staff, while providing additional services to the Committee as needed. He stated that
- 2 while employed in the congressional office, he also spent approximately 30% of his time engaged
- 3 in work related to the campaign efforts of the Committee and claimed that he was a "stickler" for
- 4 separating the work he did in his two roles.⁷
- 5 Racalto claims that he was owed the \$40,000 the Committee paid him. As support for the
- 6 legitimacy of the Committee's payment to him for campaign-related services, Racalto provided us
- 7 with over 800 campaign-related e-mails, voice mails, and text messages that he participated in,
- 8 which he claims document the campaign events, meetings, and strategy sessions in which he
- 9 provided services to the Committee. 8 Most of the e-mails span an eight-month period, from
- 10 September 2009 to April 2010, and consist of communications between Racalto and various
- campaign workers regarding fundraisers, campaign website design, and general campaign
- 12 activities.9
- In many of the e-mails Racalto was merely being copied to be kept informed. 10
- 14 Nonetheless, other documents suggest that Racalto engaged more actively in the campaign-related
- 15 work of the Committee. For instance, there are messages showing that Racalto was personally
- 16 involved in handling Rep. Massa's major donors, 11 that he approved the costs and contents of a

Racalto ROI at 1.

See Racalto Resp., Ex. A (May 24, 2010); Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0029 to -0871 (Mar. 8, 2011).

⁹ See e.g., Racalto Resp., Ex. A at JAR-FEC-0001, 0002, 0004, 0005, 0011 to -0026; Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0105, 0111, 0115, 0123, 0131, 0134, 0135, 0137, 0145, 0158, 0173, 0183-0184, 0200, 0212 to -0215, 0217, 0225, 0227, 0230, 0231, 0240, 0251, 0253, 0254, 0267, 0281, 0300, 0316, 0356, 0387, 0413, 0418, 0533, 0788 to -0817, 0834.

See, e.g., Racalto Resp., Ex. A at JAR-FEC-0003; Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0136, 0689 to -0690, 0717.

¹¹ Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0300.

- l campaign mailer, 12 that he directed payments to campaign vendors, 13 and that some campaign
- 2 vendors and staff sought his guidance or decisions concerning a campaign activity. 14 In other
- 3 messages, he offers advice regarding the campaign website and the contents of a fundraiser piece,
- 4 seeks endorsements for Massa, conducts voter outreach efforts, discusses fundraising goals and
- 5 logistics for fundraising events, and offers input into campaign strategy. 15 Racalto apparently also
- 6 helped organize campaign events in various locations, including Boston, New York, and San
- 7 Francisco. 16 In some instances, he directed payments to campaign vendors and was reimbursed for
- 8 certain campaign travel expenses, further suggesting a substantive role with the Committee. 17
- 9 Finally, Racalto assisted in terminating the Committee's activities in March 2010, and gave
- 10 instructions and opinions in e-mails concerning the payment of severance to campaign employees,
- campaign vendor debt settlement, and other "winding down" operations. 18
- Notwithstanding Racalto's interview statements and these records, other witnesses state
- 13 that Racalto was not significantly involved in campaign activities. Beverly Massa the spouse of
- 14 Rep. Massa and treasurer for the Committee since 2005 asserted that Racalto had no significant
- 15 role with respect to the 2010 campaign and disagreed with Racalto's claim that he performed

¹² Id. at JAR-FEC-0253.

¹³ Id. at JAR-FEC-0173, 0212 to -0213; Racalto Resp., Ex. A at JAR-FEC-0011.

Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0137, 0158, 0837. In one message an individual refers to refers Racalto as his "boss," but it appears that this individual may have also worked at the congressional office at some point. *Id.* at JAR-FEC-0096, 0129.

Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0106 to -0107, 0131, 0134 to -0135, 0183, 0225 to 0230. 0251, 0282, 0356, 0387; see also id. at JAR-FEC-105, 0111, 0115, 0123, 0254, 0281, 0316, 0356, 0413, 0418, 0788 to -0817, 0834 (discussing fundraising goals and events).

¹⁶ Id. at JAR-FEC-0131, -0135, -0251, -0254, -0281, -0788 to -0817.

¹⁷ Id. at JAR-FEC-0153, -0173, -0212.

¹⁸ Id. at JAR-FEC-0060 to -0061, -0217, -0710.

14

significant campaign duties. 19 She explained that she was closely involved in the campaign's 1 2 activities and related human resources issues and said that there was no contractual agreement between Racalto and the Committee. 20 She further noted that all Committee staffers and 3 4 contractors were engaged through written contracts and executed confidentiality agreements, while 5 Racalto had neither. Moreover, she observed that Racalto was not included among a list of 6 salaried campaign employees and non-salaried consultants in a memorandum prepared in 7 connection with the Committee's winding-down of operations.²¹ In an affidavit she submitted to 8 the Commission, Beverly Massa further averred that Racalto only attended and spoke at two 90minute meetings on behalf of the campaign, and that he did not attend campaign staff meetings.²² 9 10 Testimony from Neil Reiff, the Committee's counsel, and Vicki Winpisinger, the 11 Committee's assistant treasurer, tend to corroborate Beverly Massa's view. Reiff indicates that prior to March 2010, he had only met Racalto once and had never worked with him before. 23 He 12

did not know what Racalto did for the campaign, and explained that most of the time when he

contacted Massa's office he dealt with Eric or Beverly Massa directly. 24 Similarly, Winpisinger

Report of Investigation of Beverly Massa at 2 (Jul. 13, 2011) ("B. Massa ROI").

Comm. Discovery Resp. (Mar. 1, 2011), Beverly Massa Aff. ¶ 1.

Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0082. The memorandum, prepared by Winpisinger and forwarded to Racalto, also discussed what to do with the campaign's primary and general election contributions, and how to handle the remaining expenses, including money owed to employees and contractors. In another document listing campaign contacts, Racalto was likewise not included on the list. *Id.* at JAR-FEC-0187 to -0188.

See Comm. Discovery Resp., Beverly Massa Aff. ¶ 1; B. Massa ROI at 2.

Report of Investigation of Neil Reiff at 2 (May 29, 2014) ("Reiff ROI").

²⁴ Id. Although in his interview, Reiff noted that when Racalto made his request for compensation he asserted that he had participated in campaign events and meetings.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- did not know what Racalto did for the campaign.²⁵ She explained that, with the exception of some
- e-mails, she had no prior contact with Racalto before he called to obtain the \$40,000 payment.²⁶
- 3 She also did not recall ever paying Racalto for any campaign work in the past.²⁷

campaign traveling with Massa and his family as they campaigned.²⁹

We also interviewed former Rep. Massa. He stated that Racalto was never assigned campaign work, although he acknowledged that Racalto performed minimal campaign activities in connection with his role as the Chief of Staff for Massa's congressional office. Rep. Massa explained that Racalto volunteered for the campaign and spent the last ten days of the 2008

B. The Alleged Oral Agreement Between the Candidate and Racalto

It is clear that the parties never entered into a written agreement to pay Racalto for work he may have provided the Committee and it appears that Racalto was not even considered an employee or consultant of the Committee. When interviewed, Racalto did not claim any such written agreement existed; rather, he claimed that Rep. Massa orally agreed to compensate Racalto for his campaign-related work, that the payment would be deferred, and that no specific rate of compensation was discussed. According to Racalto, on March 3, 2010 — the same day that Rep. Massa announced his retirement — Rep. Massa agreed during a later conference call

Report of Investigation of Vickie Winpisinger at 1("Winpisinger ROI").

Winpisinger ROI at 1.

Id at 2. Winpisinger was the campaign's accountant and was responsible for writing checks on the campaign's account to pay vendors and payroll. Id at 1.

Report of Investigation of Eric Massa at 1-2 (Jul. 13, 2011) ("E. Massa ROI").

²⁹ *ld.* at 1.

Racalto ROI at 1.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

that the Committee would pay Racalto \$40,000 for his assistance to the campaign.³¹ Racalto acknowledges, however, that that decision was never reduced to writing.³²

Other witnesses offer differing recollections. Rep. Massa stated that he and Racalto had an unwritten salary agreement between them for his work as Massa's congressional Chief of Staff, but he claims that the first and only conversation he recalls having with Racalto concerning compensation for campaign work took place on March 3, 2010, following a press conference in which he announced his retirement from Congress. Although Rep. Massa's recollection is consistent with Racalto as to the fact and timing of a discussion about campaign-related payments, Rep. Massa asserts that that he did not agree to anything at that time, including an amount of payment. 34

The Committee's counsel, Reiff, provided information in connection with our investigation as well. He states that he was present for the conversation between Racalto and Rep. Massa after the press conference. He asserts that Racalto's request for payment appeared to him to come "out of left field." Reiff recalls that Rep. Massa directed Racalto to speak with the lawyers about payment, and that Racalto then explained to Reiff (and his co-counsel, Joseph Sandler) Racalto's plans for winding down the campaign (for which he wanted to be paid). To

³¹ *Id.* at 2.

Id. at 3. Although Racalto mentioned the existence of a contract in an e-mail he sent to Vicki Winpisinger, Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0222, as noted, we have obtained no written document memorializing any agreement concerning the payment to Racalto, and all parties including Racalto assert no such writing exists.

E. Massa ROI at 1.

³⁴ *Id.*

Reiff ROI at 1.

³⁶ Id. at 1, 3.

- 1 further justify his entitlement to some compensation, Racalto listed certain campaign events that
- 2 he had attended, but Reiff insisted that the request for payment would have to be documented.³⁷
- 3 Reiff did not recall coming to any agreement with Racalto concerning his request for payment at
- 4 that time or its amount, and recalls that the only other time he spoke with Racalto that weekend
- 5 they did not discuss compensation at all.³⁸
- 6 For her part, Beverly Massa recalls speaking to Racalto multiple times by phone on
- 7 March 3, 2010, but states that there was no discussion regarding possible compensation during
- 8 any of those phone calls.³⁹
- 9 Records reflect that the next day, March 4, 2010, Racalto first called and then e-mailed
- 10 Vickie Winpisinger requesting the \$40,000 payment as a "consulting fee," and sent an e-mail to
- Reiff containing an invoice for his consulting services.⁴⁰ In his call and e-mail to Winpisinger,
- 12 Racalto emphasizes the need for the payment because he was getting his braces removed and
- claimed that Rep. Massa had approved the \$40,000 payment. The invoice Racalto provided to
- 14 the Committee sought \$40,000 for his work in connection with campaign activities through
- 15 March 4, 2010 and prospectively for work to be provided until December 2010. The invoice was
- 16 submitted as an e-mail to Reiff, stating:

³⁷ *Id.* at 3.

³⁸ *Id.* at 4.

B. Massa ROI at 2.

See Racalto Doc., Attach, at JAR-FEC-0222. Racalto's e-mail appears to be in response to a memorandum Winpisinger sent on the subject of closing of the campaign. *Id.* at JAR-FEC-0081 to -0082.

Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0222; Winpisinger ROI at 1. Racalto apparently mentioned approval of the payment to Dorothy Drahzal, the Committee's political director, as well. In a March 4, 2010, text message to Racalto, Drahzal lists a number of action items that she had discussed with Reiff and included the payment to Racalto as one of them. Specifically, the text states that she would "ask Vickie to do the \$40K to you and Bev gives her written approval." Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0032.

MUR 6275 (Massa for Congress) Second General Counsel's Report Page 11

1 2	Invoice for Joe Racalto
3 4 5	Consulting fee (\$30,000 election cycle) Liason between NY and Washington Managed fundraiser and staffing for Massa for Congress
6 7 8 9	March, 4, 2010 – December 2010 (\$10,000) Manage final disbursement of campaign fund and close campaign
10	Total: \$40,000: ⁴²
11	In response to a question from Reiff, Racalto stated in an e-mail that his "consulting fee"
12	included work from January 1, 2009 through March 3, 2010. ⁴³ The invoice also included a
13	\$10,000 demand relating to future work to close the campaign between March 2010 and
1.4	December 2010. In response to our questions concerning that component of the invoice, Racalto
15	acknowledged that he resigned well before December 2010 and that the Committee's counsel
16	had already taken over campaign duties after Eric Massa's resignation. ⁴⁴ Rep. Massa also
17	indicated that he had no contact with Racalto after March 8, 2010.45
18	C. The Authorization to Pay Racalto \$40,000 in Committee Funds
19	Rep. Massa claims that he was upset and angry when he learned that Racalto had been paid
20	\$40,000, an amount he said was never agreed upon or authorized by him. 46 In contrast to
21	Racalto's interview statements, Rep. Massa stated that the specific amount of \$40,000 had never

Id. at JAR-FEC-0055. Racalto indicated to us that the Committee hired a campaign manager in mid-2009, but that he continued to be involved in all aspects of the campaign. Racalto ROI at 1.

Racalto ROI at 3; Racalto Doc., Attach, at JAR-FEC-0057.

E. Massa ROI at 2.

E. Massa ROI at 2; Reiff ROI at 2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- been discussed between them and asserted that Racalto lied about Massa agreeing to the payment
 in order to induce authorization of the payment.⁴⁷
 - Winpisinger told us that she felt uneasy about the payment to Racalto and contacted Reiff for approval of the disbursement, telling counsel that as long as he signed off on the payment to Racalto, she "would do what [she was] told." Reiff responded to Winpisinger via e-mail, stating, "Yes, I am aware of all this, thanks." Reiff explained that when he spoke with Winpisinger he was busy at a speaking engagement and his only focus was on the legality of the payment i.e., whether the payment was a permissible campaign use or an illegal personal use of funds. Because the payment was ostensibly for past campaign work and future wind-down, he concluded it was permissible and assented to the payment. At the time, Reiff thought he was being consulted for the limited question of the payment's legality under the Act and did not realize that his assent was apparently being considered as the final word on whether to make the payment and in what amount. Reiff claims that Racalto "seemed to be working in Eric's interests" so it did not occur to him that Racalto may have been taking advantage of the chaos in the campaign. Reiff states that Winpisinger told him that Racalto needed the payment soon to pay to get his braces taken off and that Rep. Massa had approved the payment.

E. Massa ROI at 2. Reiff recalled a phone call that he received from Rep. Massa on Friday, March 5, 2010, during which Massa was angry about the payment, stating that Racalto "robbed him." Reiff ROI at 2.

See Comm. Discovery Resp. at EJJM 010.

See id. Subsequently, at Racalto's request in connection with communication with Racalto's credit union, Winpisinger confirmed in a March 30, 2010, e-mail that the \$40,000 payment was Racalto's compensation for work performed for the Committee. See Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0049.

⁵⁰ Reiff ROI at 2.

⁵¹ ld.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

that the amount of the payment was not out of the ordinary, and he had no reason to question the

payment for that reason.⁵²

Winpisinger explained to us that she was required to get approval from Committee treasurer Beverly Massa for every check written with the exception of payroll checks.⁵³ In addition, the Committee did not maintain a significant balance in the disbursement account that Winpisinger could access, thus requiring Winpisinger to request that Beverly Massa transfer funds into the account when she needed to make a disbursement.⁵⁴ To effect the payment to Racalto, Winpisinger e-mailed Beverly Massa on March 4, 2010, and asked her to transfer funds into the account because "Joe Racalto has asked me to send him a check for \$40,000." Beverly Massa then transferred the money and Winpisinger disbursed the check to Racalto on March 4, 2010. The second s

Beverly Massa also indicated that Racalto never discussed compensation with her during multiple phone calls they had on March 3, after her husband announced his retirement. ⁵⁷ We questioned Beverly Massa about her role in authorizing the disbursement. She acknowledged that she transferred the funds into the account when Winpisinger asked her to, but claimed that she did not focus on the stated reason for the request because she was distracted by the circumstances of

⁵² Id.

Winpisinger ROI at 1.

⁵⁴ *ld*. at 1.

See Comm. Disc. Resp. at EJJM 003.

The check, dated March 4, 2010, contains no notation suggesting its purpose. See Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0203.

⁵⁷ B. Massa ROI at 2.

9

10

11

12

13

- 1 Massa's sudden retirement announcement.⁵⁸ She assumed Winpisinger was requesting the money
- 2 in connection with winding down the campaign, since the requested amount itself was not
- 3 extraordinary. 59 Beverly Massa conceded that she reviewed the e-mail from Winpisinger that
- 4 stated that the transfer related to a \$40,000 payment to Racalto, but asserted that she understood
- 5 that to mean only that Racalto had requested a check for \$40,000, as neither Winpisinger nor
- 6 Racalto informed her of its purpose that is, to compensate Racalto himself for assistance he
- 7 claimed he had provided the Committee. 60

D. Subsequent Activity and Claims Concerning the Payment

On the same day that Racalto received his \$40,000 payment from the Committee, two members of Massa's campaign staff were offered "severance payments" — albeit in smaller amounts than Racalto received, consisting of one and four months' salary and health insurance coverage, respectively. Reiff prepared the severance paperwork, drafts of which contained mutual releases and confidentiality agreements. Apparently the Committee sought to prepare the

Id. Reiff explained that the Massas were in fact largely unavailable on March 3 and 4 as a result of the events, and then the following week Beverly Massa accompanied Rep. Massa on a week of public appearances to deal with the fallout of his resignation. Reiff ROI at 3.

⁵⁹ B. Massa ROI at 2.

Comm. Discovery Resp. at EJJM 003. Rep. Massa was unavailable on March 4—the day after his resignation—as he was "physically and mentally exhausted." *Id.* at EJJM 001; Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-0047. During that absence, Rep. Massa "directed that all questions for his consideration be referred to counsel for later discussion and resolution." Comm. Discovery Resp. at EJJM 001. Nonetheless, Racalto "pressured" Winpisinger during the afternoon of March 4 to issue the payment to him "because of certain personal bills that he, Mr. Racalto, needed to pay." *Id.* According to Reiff, Racalto claimed that he needed the funds to pay to get his braces taken off. Reiff ROI at 2.

Id. at JAR-FEC-0060 to -62. In one of the e-mails concerning these severances, Drahzal expressed concern that the individual receiving 4 months' severance had worked for the campaign only 60 days, but the payment was made because Rep. Massa had directed it. Id. The recipients of those payments apparently were required to sign agreements that Reiff drafted imposing certain obligations on them, including the requirement that the severed staff return any campaign materials to the Committee. Id. Racalto did not sign any such agreement.

- 1 agreements quickly: in an e-mail exchange with Drahzal, Winpisinger, and Racalto, Reiff
- 2 explained that he "whipped these up in a rush." Those e-mail exchanges further reflect that
- 3 Racalto was among the group that determined the amount and conditions relating to these
- 4 severances. 63
- 5 The parties have described the purpose of the payment to Racalto differently over time.
- 6 Following the issuance of the payment to Racalto, in a March 15, 2010, letter to the Clerk of the
- 7 U.S. House of Representatives, Racalto described the compensation as "severance." 64 On
- 8 March 30, 2010, Winpisinger received an inquiry apparently related to a mortgage application
- 9 Racalto had made with a financial institution, and stated that the payment to Racalto was
- 10 "compensation." The first documented indication that the Committee disputed the legitimacy
- of the payment followed news reports relating to the Committee's disclosure of the payment in
- its 2010 April Quarterly Report, filed April 15, 2010. On April 19, 2010, counsel for the
- 13 Committee sent Racalto a letter in which it demanded that Racalto return the full \$40,000
- payment, asserting that the public interest generated by the filing, caused the Committee to
- 15 "review[] its internal records and documentation relating to that payment."66
- In response to our discovery requests, the Committee and Rep. Massa have acknowledged
- that Racalto was "entitled to some amount of payment for services to the campaign." The

⁶² Id. at JAR-FEC-0060, 0700 to -0709.

⁶³ *Id*.

B. Massa ROI at 3; Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-042. In his letter to the Clerk, Racalto requests a salary decrease based on the \$40,000 "severance" in order to comply with the Speakers Pay Cap. *Id*.

⁶⁵ Racalto Doc., Attach. at JAR-FEC-049.

⁶⁶ Id. at JAR-FEC-0047.

⁶⁷ Comm. Discovery Resp., B. Massa Aff. at 1.

- 1 Committee nonetheless denies that it owed Racalto \$40,000 and claims that the payment was not
- 2 properly authorized. 68 Beverly Massa alleges in a sworn statement that Racalto "embezzled" the
- 3 \$40,000.69 In his interview with us, Reiff stated that he believed that they "were all played."70
- 4 As noted, after the payment became the subject of media attention and the Committee's
- 5 demand that Racalto return the funds failed, the Committee filed suit against Racalto in New York
- 6 state court. The Committee's civil complaint alleges that Racalto fraudulently obtained \$40,000
- 7 from the Committee through misrepresentations and thereby was unjustly enriched and wrongfully
- 8 converted the Committee's funds. The lawsuit survived Racalto's motion to dismiss filed August
- 9 2011, but no public activity has occurred in connection with the action since it entered the
- 10 discovery stage.⁷¹

IV. ANALYSIS

The Act provides that each treasurer of a political committee must file reports of receipts and disbursements disclosing the amount and nature of any outstanding debts or obligations the committee owes or is owed.⁷² Any such debts or obligations must continuously be reported until

See id. at 2; E. Massa ROI at 2.

See id., Comm. Resp. Beverly Massa Aff. at 2-3.

⁷⁰ Reiff ROI at 3.

Massa for Congress v. Joseph Racalto, Decision and Order, No. 2011-1690CV (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Monroe Cnty) (denying motion to dismiss); see Andrew Poole, Massa-Racalto Going to Trial, EVENING TRIB. (Aug. 5, 2011), http://www.eveningtribune.com/features/x919513577/Massa-Racalto-going-to-trial. On October 24, 2013, this Office confirmed with the Clerk of Court that no new filings or developments had occurred since the motion to dismiss was denied.

⁷² 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b)(8) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(8)); 11 C.F.R. § 104.3(b).

extinguished.⁷³ If the exact amount of a debt or obligation is unknown, the committee should report an approximate amount and state that the amount reported is an estimate.⁷⁴

It is uncontested here that no written agreement concerning Racalto's work for the Committee was executed. Moreover, we were unable to confirm that the Committee and Racalto entered into either an oral agreement to compensate him for work he provided the Committee, to a specific amount of any such compensation, or whether to defer his compensation to a later date. Racalto has not produced any document or other information to support his claim that there was an agreement that he was to be paid at a later date for his services to the Committee and admits that a written agreement does not exist. The Massas deny that there was any agreement, oral or written, and other witnesses, including Reiff and Winpisinger, state that they were unaware of any work Racalto may have done for the campaign or the existence of any agreement to pay him for campaign work. Because we are aware of no affirmative evidence indicating the existence of a prior agreement, deferred compensation arrangement, or even a demand for payment prior to the reporting period in which the payment was tendered to Racalto, we conclude that the Committee did not fail to report a pre-existing debt on its relevant disclosure reports,

Nonetheless, the parties themselves generally agree that Racalto was entitled to some compensation for his work for the Committee, although the amount remains disputed. The record currently before the Commission suggests that almost all of Racalto's demonstrable campaign-related work occurred during the same April quarterly reporting period in which the

⁷³ 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b)(8) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(8)); 11 C.F.R. § 104.1.1(a).

¹¹ C.F.R. § 104.11(b). If a committee does not pay an employee for services rendered "in accordance with an employment contract or a formal or informal agreement to do so," the unpaid amount either may be treated as a debt owed by the committee to the employee, or — if the employee signs a written statement agreeing to be considered a volunteer — converted to a volunteer services arrangement under 11 C.F.R. § 100.74. See id. § 116.6.(a).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

demand and payment were made — that is, between January 1, 2010, and March 31, 2010. If so,

2 there would have been no substantial debt to report prior to that reporting period. Moreover,

3 even if the payment were characterized not as compensation but as severance — similar to the

4 payments other campaign staffers received at the same time — such a payment would not

5 constitute a debt that should have been reported in an earlier disclosure report. We therefore

recommend that the Commission take no further action as to the Committee for failing to report

unpaid salary as a debt under 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)).

The Complaint also alleges that the Committee's \$40,000 payment to Racalto amounted to an impermissible personal use of campaign funds in violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30114 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a). An expenditure becomes the "personal use" of campaign funds only when a present or former candidate uses campaign funds to fulfill a commitment, obligation, or expense of a person that would exist "irrespective of" the candidate's election or individual duties as a holder of federal office. Candidates and committees nonetheless enjoy wide latitude to use campaign funds for lawful purposes, including employing staff, compensating individuals for their services, and paying incidental expenses.

The Complaint suggests that the payment to Racalto may have been made as an inducement to silence his harassment claims against Rep. Massa, an allegation premised on the amount and timing of the payment. Our investigation, however, failed to uncover any evidentiary basis to infer that the payment was made for a personal or unlawful purpose, beyond

⁷⁵ 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)).

See id. § 30114(a) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(a)); MUR 5701 (Filner) (Commission found no personal use violation where committee funds were used to pay a consultant fair market value for bona fide services); Advisory Op. 1993-06 (Citizens for Congressman Panetta) (Committee funds may be used for, among other things, salaries of those hired to prepare and file disclosure reports with the Commission); Advisory Op. 1978-43 (Congresswoman Barbara Jordan) (Committee funds may be expended to employ staff and pay incidental expenses).

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 its timing and the fact of Racalto's charges against Rep. Massa. Indeed, both the Committee and

2 Racalto agree that Racalto provided some work for the Committee related to the campaign, and

3 that he was due some amount of compensation in return. And notwithstanding the confusion

4 within the Committee structure at the time of the candidate's resignation, the disbursement it

issued was approved by Committee counsel, the treasurer, and the assistant freasurer, appears to

6 have been issued at the same time that several former campaign employees were provided

severance in relation to their work for the Committee, and we have uncovered no evidence

suggesting that Rep. Massa or any official connected to the Committee sought to conceal the

9 payment to Racalto.

Given that record, we are unable to state conclusively that the payment to Racalto was made to fulfill an obligation that existed "irrespective of" Rep. Massa's election campaign or duties as an officeholder. And in view of the substantial latitude afforded candidates and committees to make disbursements for campaign-related services, coupled with the lack of substantial affirmative evidence that the payment was made for an unlawful purpose, we conclude that additional Commission action relating to the value of the services Racalto provided the Committee — the subject of ongoing civil litigation between the parties and difficult to discern in any event — would be wasteful and unwarranted under the circumstances. Accordingly, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the allegation that the Committee, Eric Massa, or Racalto violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)) in connection with the Committee's payment to Racalto, and close the file.

⁷⁷ See 52 U.S.C. § 30114 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a).

See Heckler v. Cheney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985); Statement of Policy Regarding Commission Action in Matters at the Initial Stage in the Enforcement Process, 72 Fed. Reg. 12,545, 12,546 (Mar. 16, 2007) (recognizing that dismissal may be warranted due to factors such as the "vagueness or weakness of the evidence").

V. <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

- 1. Take no further action as to Massa for Congress and Beverly Massa in her official capacity as treasurer, concerning the alleged violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30104 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)).
- 2. Dismiss the allegation that Massa for Congress and Beverly Massa, in her official capacity as treasurer, or Eric Massa violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)).
- 3. Dismiss the allegation that Joseph Racalto violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b)).
- 4. Approve the attached factual and legal analyses.
- 5. Approve the appropriate letters.
- 6. Close the file.

09/23/14 Date

BY: Daniel A. Petalas

Associate General Counsel for Enforcement

Peter G. Blumberg
Assistant General Counsel

Ana J. Peña-Wallace

Attorney